REMARKS

Claims 1-22 are currently pending. Claims 1-5, 7-17, and 19-22 have been amended.

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for his consideration during the telephone conference on January 19, 2006. During the telephone conference, the Examiner and applicant's representative discussed the proposed claim amendments in view of the cited reference Mackinlay.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-9 and 13-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Mackinlay, and claims 10-12 and 16-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mackinlay in view of Levinson. Even though applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner, applicant has amended independent claims 1, 10, 13, 17, and 22 to further clarify the invention.

Applicant's technique is generally directed toward a method for generating linear timelines to show, for example, progress information of a project. According to applicant's technique, a user selects a portion of a parent timeline covering a time span, for example, from March 1 to June 1, to generate a child timeline. The portion can include a first data item (e.g., a first milestone "shipment to customers") located at April 1. The child timeline generated has a time span that corresponds to the selected portion (e.g., from March 1 to June 1) and contains a second data item corresponding to the first data item (e.g., a second milestone "shipment to customers" located at April 1). The parent and the child timelines are dynamically linked such that when one data item on one timeline is modified, the corresponding data item on the other timeline is automatically modified. For example, if the first milestone "shipment to customers" on the parent timeline is moved from April 1 to May 1 on the parent timeline, the corresponding second milestone is automatically moved to May 1 on the child timeline. Similarly, if the second milestone on the child timeline is moved from April 1 to April 15, then the corresponding first milestone is automatically moved to April 15 on the parent timeline.

Mackinlay describes a technique for displaying calendar information in a 3D fashion ("the Spiral Calendar"). (see page 109, paragraph 1). Various calendars are arranged in a receding fashion such that details are emphasized and context is reduced. For example, a day calendar can be displayed in a spiral fashion as "growing" out of a week calendar receded in the background (see page 111, Figure 3).

Even assuming, *arguendo*, that a calendar can be considered as a timeline, Mackinlay does not teach or suggest "when the first data item of the parent timeline is modified, the second data item of the child timeline is automatically modified to conform to the first data item," as recited in the pending claims. Mackinlay teaches displaying details of a selected calendar via animation when a user clicks on a particular calendar in the spiral (see page 111). The animation does not modify any data items (e.g., milestones) contained in any of the calendars but merely changes the focus of the user interface. Furthermore, Mackinlay does not teach or suggest that "both the parent and child timelines are linear," as recited in the pending claims. Instead, the calendars in Mackinlay are arranged in a 3D spiral, and thus cannot be linear. As a result, Mackinlay neither teaches nor suggests at least one feature of the pending claims. Moreover, the claims recite a novel combination of elements that is neither taught nor suggested by the cited reference.

Based upon the above amendment and remarks, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application and its early allowance. If the Examiner has any questions or would believe that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned representative at (206) 359-6038.

Dated: 2/10/04

Respectfully submitted,

By _____

"Jim" Chen Liang
Registration No.: 51,945
PERKINS COIE LLP
P.O. Box 1247
Seattle, Washington 98111-1247
(206) 359-8548
(206) 359-9548 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant